

**ABSTRACT**

A wire-collecting device of a computer accessory has a casing having a first opening and a collecting portion inside the casing for containing a signal-transmission device extending from the computer accessory. A fastening device is positioned on a first interior surface of the casing, the fastening device being positioned near the first opening to clasp the signal-transmission device. An elastic element has a first terminal and a second terminal, the first terminal being installed into a second interior surface of the casing, and the second terminal being connected to the signal-transmission device to force the signal-transmission device to draw back into the collecting portion.


drive the rolling up of the mouse cord 22; whereas, the claimed elastic element is "... to force the signal-transmission device to draw back into the collecting portion." Therefore, it is obvious that the elastic element (e.g., 302) of claim 10 is different from coil spring 50 of the Snyder patent in both structural connection and purpose, and not similar, as required for rejection.

Then, too, the second interior surface 3014 in our specification is a fixed base to bring the support force to the elastic element 302. But the detents 46 in the Snyder patent (shown in the Fig.5) are only to produce arresting work for tooth structure of the wheel 38. It is obvious that the second interior surface 3014 of our specification and the cited detents are also different.

It is axiomatic in U.S. patent law that, in order for a reference to anticipate a claimed structure, it must clearly disclose each and every feature of the claimed structure. In view of the above-mentioned facts, Applicant submits that the Snyder patent does not disclose or suggest each and every feature of independent claim 10 nor, therefore, its dependent claims, whereby it cannot anticipate these claims under 35 U.S.C. §102.

Reconsideration and allowance are, therefore, requested.

Respectfully submitted,

  
William R. Evans  
c/o Ladas & Parry LLP  
26 West 61<sup>st</sup> Street  
New York, New York 10023  
Reg. No. 25858  
Tel. No. (212) 708-1930

drive the rolling up of the mouse cord 22; whereas, the claimed elastic element is "... to force the signal-transmission device to draw back into the collecting portion." Therefore, it is obvious that the elastic element (e.g., 302) of claim 10 is different from coil spring 50 of the Snyder patent in both structural connection and purpose, and not similar, as required for rejection.

Then, too, the second interior surface 3014 in our specification is a fixed base to bring the support force to the elastic element 302. But the detents 46 in the Snyder patent (shown in the Fig.5) are only to produce arresting work for tooth structure of the wheel 38. It is obvious that the second interior surface 3014 of our specification and the cited detents are also different.

It is axiomatic in U.S. patent law that, in order for a reference to anticipate a claimed structure, it must clearly disclose each and every feature of the claimed structure. In view of the above-mentioned facts, Applicant submits that the Snyder patent does not disclose or suggest each and every feature of independent claim 10 nor, therefore, its dependent claims, whereby it cannot anticipate these claims under 35 U.S.C. §102.

Reconsideration and allowance are, therefore, requested.

Respectfully submitted,

---

William R. Evans  
c/o Ladas & Parry LLP  
26 West 61<sup>st</sup> Street  
New York, New York 10023  
Reg. No. 25858  
Tel. No. (212) 708-1930